

**MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING  
OF  
GREENSBORO PLANNING BOARD**

**JANUARY 21, 2004**

The Greensboro Planning Board met in Regular Session on Wednesday, January 21, 2004 at 2:00 p.m., in the City Council Chambers, 2nd floor, Melvin Municipal Office Building, Greensboro, North Carolina. Board Members present were Chair Patrick Downs, J.P. McIntyre, John Rhodes, Tim Bryson, Julius Koonce, Dick Hall and Stephen Marks. Staff members present were Robert Morgan, Assistant City Manager; Bill Ruska, Alec MacIntosh and Haywood Cloud, of the Planning Department and Dan Curry of the Housing and Community Development Department (HCD).

Chair Downs called the meeting of the Planning Board to order.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 17, 2003 REGULAR MEETING.**

Mr. McIntyre said there was one small correction; his name should have been listed as J. P. (as in Patrick) McIntyre.

Mr. McIntyre moved approval of the minutes as amended, seconded by Mr. Bryson. The Board voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Downs, McIntyre, Rhodes, Bryson, Marks, Koonce, Hall. Nays: None.)

**PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

**A. REVISIONS TO OLE ASHEBORO REDEVELOPMENT PLAN CONCERNING THE MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. DRIVE NORTH INITIATIVE, DOROTHY BROWN PARK AND THE DOUGLAS PARK AREA (CONTINUED FROM DECEMBER MEETING). (RECOMMENDED)**

Mr. Curry said this was probably the most fun part of his job because he got to come up and talk about some great work that has been done by one of our community organizations. In this case, it is the Ole Asheboro Neighborhood and the Ole Asheboro Neighborhood Advisory Committee. He said Carl Brower, chairperson of the committee, was present and would be glad to answer any questions the Board might have from the neighborhood perspective. He said the community in Ole Asheboro had been hard at work for the past year, trying to figure out how to craft a vision for quite a lot of property in their neighborhood that is now ready for development.

The Ole Asheboro Redevelopment Area was originally designated in the mid 1980s. A lot has been accomplished then. School buildings have been renovated, over 100 new homes have been built and a great deal of rehabilitation work has been undertaken in this historic area. However, 20 years is a long time for any plan and this plan is more than overdue for updating. Roughly two years ago, a committee was formed of neighborhood residents,

property owners and some other interests in the community. They set about to put together what you will see here today. He said it was dramatic, it was innovative, and staff thought it was also quite doable.

Mr. Curry said to give some general boundaries, the northern boundary of Ole Asheboro runs along Lee Street on the north, Bennett Street is the eastern boundary, Florida Street is the southern boundary and then the area comes up Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive (MLK) and then goes over to Arlington Street, which forms the western boundary. He said there had been a lot of information in the newspapers recently about the South Elm Area, which is the brownfield area that abuts Ole Asheboro. So not only will there be a lot of activity going in the Ole Asheboro Neighborhood, but immediately to the west you will be seeing over the coming years a lot of activity. You are already seeing a lot of work occurring in the Southside Neighborhood, which is just to the north of Ole Asheboro.

Mr. Curry said staff would speak about four initiatives, and then talk a little about the implementation work ahead of them for this plan. The four initiatives include the MLK North Initiative, which is located in the northwestern corner of the community; the Dorothy Brown Park Initiative, which seeks to do some redesign and development work around the existing Dorothy Brown Park in the southern part of the neighborhood; the Douglas Park Initiative, which is an enhancement activity of the existing Douglas Park; and Greenways and Urban Gardens, which is an initiative the neighborhood has interest in pursuing.

Mr. Curry said he would start with the MLK North Initiative. This is an area along Lee Street at the northern end of the neighborhood. It is the area that has the largest concentration of vacant sites. There are approximately 8 acres of vacant property in this area, which is a substantial amount of land in the center city. Basically what was being shown in the aerial sketch are the three primary blocks of this initiative, a block on the west side of MLK, a block on the east side of MLK and a block just to the south of those centered around the Nettie Coad Apartments, which is a renovated elementary school building. Those are the primary development zones for this initiative.

He then explained a plan view showing some of the design characteristics envisioned in this corridor. He said some of the features would be the same as now being developed in the Southside Neighborhood. He pointed out the one building still existing in one of the blocks along MLK and said that was an old fire station, which was envisioned to stay and be sort of a model of how the rest of that block would develop.

In response to a question from Mr. Koonce, Mr. Curry said the question of the two exits off Lee Street would probably not be answered until they get into seeking development proposals even though this particular sketch shows the ramp that comes from Lee Street up to MLK being gone and that area being used for development space or open space. He said there would be no relocation of residents with this plan since there are no residents living on the sites proposed for development. As to affordability of units under the new plan, Mr. Curry said that would be mixed. The criteria put out will be a mix of styles, mix of sizes of units, which would result in a mix of prices as well.

Mr. Curry said the intention was for this all to be privately funded and developed. The subsidy that the City provides is in the process of assembling the land and there may be some reduction in the cost of that land, but the cost of most of the site development work, the cost of the building construction would all be privately financed. Staff does not envision a great deal of public subsidy going into any of that development work. He said the City and the Redevelopment Commission control almost all of this land. There are several parcels that are on a proposed acquisition list, which he would get to in just a second. The planning will include architectural controls as well.

Mr. Curry said the next initiative was the Dorothy Brown Park Initiative. He presented a slide giving a broader perspective of the area. He pointed out the exact location of the Dorothy Brown Park. The designers have identified a much longer green space connection possibly in this part of Greensboro. He pointed out an area that was not actually a part of the development plan. It is all privately owned land, so this is simply a suggestion to private property owners on what they might consider as they look to ways to use their own properties. He said churches owned most of the property. If those churches choose to do some residential development work, here is one way it could happen and take advantage of the green space and the waterway. The real site that staff is considering is currently Dorothy Brown Park. This was a project developed in the mid 1990s, including the 6 houses on the north side of the park and then the rest of the park was developed simply as open space. It was meant to be a passive park, not a lot of active recreational uses or equipment or that sort of thing, and that is what it is today. The community has indicated that while it is a nice open space, it is not very well used. It does have a trail that goes through it and that is about the only thing that is there. So their Urban Design Team came up with the concept of how to create two smaller, more intimate green spaces that would provide a more secure, a better environment for children to play, people to be, with some additional development work adjacent to those spaces so that you begin to get the "eyes on the park", which helps the security of these two small spaces. Single-family homes would be built on the remainder of the park space. The community supports this concept and Parks & Rec supports the concept of creating two smaller, a little more highly developed parks.

The third initiative is Douglas Park. Douglas Park is one of the historic amenities of this community. It is a lovely old park with a lot of very nice stone work and just a great space in which to be. There were some early plans when they were working through this process of possible ways to bring some additional housing units onto this site to help with some of the security issues that existed in the park. He presented some of the sketches the Design Team had put together, showing various alternative ways you could connect a street through, put some housing in on portions of the park land. In the end, the community consensus was they wanted to keep the park as a park with all the land still being used as a park and they wanted to enhance that park facility, particularly the western corner of the park, which used to be a playfield for the elementary school when it was operating on MLK. It is just an open field right now. Staff will be working with the neighborhood to look at what kind of enhancements can be made in that part of the park, as well as the overall park facility to continue for that area to be an outstanding community park for the neighborhood.

The final initiative concerns greenways and urban gardens. There are a number of greenways that cross through this neighborhood, almost all privately owned land, so it all runs between houses and behind houses. It is a neighborhood project to work with individual

property owners, to clean up back yards, to come up with some sort of unifying methods of cleaning up this green space. It would also include taking some corner locations where there is a little bit of public land and perhaps doing some public gardening. So this is an initiative that would be primarily driven by the neighborhood residents. This is not something the City would have a whole lot of funding or involvement in.

Moving on to some more detailed implementation pieces of the plan, he said the plan does have a set of Urban Design Guidelines. This talks about things such as street setbacks, buildable zones on each individual property, and specific Guidelines for the retail areas and some of the housing areas, particular to the blocks in which they would be used. There are also Architectural Design Guidelines. These would be used as staff crafts a Traditional Neighborhood Development Plan and Zone in this community, and then made a part of each development prospectus that would be put out for proposals. Again, clearly the Guidelines will play up the historic character of the area.

In terms of the details of the Plan, staff does have some acquisition work to do. The areas in green on the map were properties already owned by the City or the Redevelopment Commission. The areas in red have already been bought and sold by the Redevelopment Commission. Those parcels in yellow are the parcels that are on the acquisition list and are properties that are still subject to purchase by the Redevelopment Commission. He pointed to the primary parcels at which they would be looking in the near term, which finish off the two primary development blocks.

He presented a blowup of a particular parcel of land. He said the Board has before it some information that was actually developed yesterday evening. The Redevelopment Commission met last evening and property owners objected to their property being a part of this acquisition plan. That is the Music Garden property on Arlington Street. A memorandum of understanding was developed last night and approved by the property owners and the Redevelopment Commission that will exclude this area, generally identified in the red line, from the acquisition list and from the acquisition map. It will still allow the rest of the property, which is the rest of this corner, to be included on the acquisition map, subject to some additional study work that is going to be undertaken by the owners and the neighborhood to determine the use of the rest of that property. The owners have an idea in mind for an urban park in this corner, so they and the community will be working together to see if that is a doable proposition. He said this was one change in the plan sent to the Board earlier.

Mr. Curry presented a general budget for what staff thinks this project will cost in terms of public funds. There is still some property assembly work. There is a little bit of environmental cleanup work. Work is still being done on some of the sites already purchased. The public infrastructure work - streets, utility, street lighting - that sort of thing is a major expense. Staff does not know yet whether all of this will be public funds or whether the private developer will actually pay some of this for. Obviously, staff will try to limit the public exposure in terms of infrastructure work, but they do suspect that the public side will have to put some of the street construction and utility work into these development sites to make them attractive to private developers. There is a land sales figure that staff plugs in. They do intend to sell land in this area, so those funds go back into the project, offsetting some of that cost. Roughly \$2 million is what staff is looking at as a public investment as a maximum, and hopefully it will be less as they work through the project. A big part of that

funding will come from the Community Development Block Grant Program. Staff already has the first installment of this remaining work in their budget for next year and they estimate that they will budget those funds over the next three years to complete this project.

Two zoning changes are envisioned as a part of this plan and at least one of them will come back to this group. That will be the City's third Traditional Neighborhood Development Zone (TND). That was identified in the MLK North Initiative area. Staff expects to prepare a TND plan for this area and that plan will come back to this Board for review. The second area proposed for rezoning is the Dorothy Brown Park area where he mentioned that they will probably ask for a rezoning to RS-5 to allow a slightly smaller lot pattern to allow some additional housing units adjacent to those new park areas.

Mr. Curry then gave a brief overview of the process through which staff would go in preparing this plan. He said it was exciting to staff to see some great work done in this neighborhood and they would to thank this Board for its time and all the residents who have worked on it. He said staff was proud to recommend this plan to the Board for its action. He said Mr. Brower was also present and they would be glad to answer any questions.

In response to a question from Chair Downs, Mr. Curry said in those parts of the plan where mixed use is envisioned, it will require a mixed-use plan. In the first block of MLK there will be requirements that first floor space be either retail or an office-type of use. That will be part of the requirements. It will also have to meet the overall intent of TND zoning, which includes a requirement that there be a mixture of uses; that it cannot be all residential. In order to comply with TND zoning, you have to have a mix of residential and non-residential uses. As to affordable housing, he said for the most part he thought that would be left to the market. Staff has not gotten to that level of detail with the community yet in terms of reviewing the specific development prospectus. That will come over the coming months. However, he thought for the most part the way they have worked in Southside and some of the other development areas, the issue of affordability is left to the private market to determine. Mr. Brower might wish to speak to that, but that is probably where they would leave it. He said part of the criteria in a development prospectus might very well be to demonstrate how you are achieving diversity and affordability. While it might not be an actual requirement, it may be strongly encouraged through how you rate proposals to achieve some of those kinds of objectives.

Mr. Curry said that normally the Redevelopment Commission is the body that gets into the review of the actual development standards, and the development prospectus certainly goes through the Redevelopment Commission for review. If this Board would like an opportunity to review that, staff would be glad to give the Board that opportunity. But the Redevelopment Commission is the body that is officially appointed to oversee the development work. These agreements will be directly between private developers and the Redevelopment Commission, which will be selling the property.

Mr. Marks said the reality of it was that with the cost of construction today, it was going to be hard to make this affordable housing. He asked if this qualified for any Federal subsidies or any loan programs that would help.

Mr. Curry said they have a number of programs that fund affordable home ownership and affordable rental development, and those can be brought to bear on this neighborhood as they could be used anywhere in the city. Staff has, in fact, discussed the potential at the Nettie Coad Apartment site, which is currently a very low rent apartment development owned by the City, of expanding that development with some additional units. That could very easily be a proposal that would take advantage of some of the Federal and State low income tax credits that are available. In fact, that is probably how staff would envision it occurring. In any opportunities like that, certainly developers would want to take advantage of benefits that are out there. The same thing could occur with their home ownership program. He would expect some of the new home ownership units, particularly single-family homes being built in this neighborhood, would certainly take advantage of the City's current second mortgage program.

Mr. Bryson said he had worked with Nate Bowman in the redevelopment of Southside and he was supportive of that project, as he was of this one. However, he would like to see the Guidelines, as far as development, because he knew personally of several developers that had come to staff in hopes of developing some of this property and verbally staff had tied some of the property that the City owns up with Mr. Bowman, which is not a negative. He felt that a project like Ole Asheboro is an incredible project, but he felt like it could be developed with some of the talent locally. Mr. Bowman is a native of Charlotte and a lot of the people here locally would like to develop some of this property. So he would like to see those Guidelines. That was the only real concern or issue that he had.

Mr. Curry said that the Southside project was from the very beginning set up to be developed under a master developer and so there was one agreement with the master developer for the whole project. Staff envisions separate development agreements for the main blocks in this project, so they do not envision a master developer taking on the entire range of sites in this community. In fact, the neighborhood has made it pretty clear that they want opportunities for a variety of builders, including some small local builders to have pieces of this development work.

Mr. Curry said it would evolve and would be a phased project. Probably the first two blocks coming south of Lee Street will be Phase 1. You will see those development sites going on the market first. As you work your way down MLK, those sites are going to come on line six months or a year later. From a marketing standpoint, they want to take advantage of what is happening in the community, but there is only so much that the market is going to be able to accept at one time, so they will market those sites incrementally.

Mr. Rhodes said he wanted to preface his comments with this statement. He wanted to sort of set the record straight somewhat having to do with their December meeting. The minutes will reflect that he had some serious reservations regarding this particular development. He did some research on his own and he found out that what had been rumored was untrue. He was provided with a document by Ms. Kuns obtained from the U. S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, and it was the National Register of Historic Places registration form. He did this because he had heard some invalid comments having to do with the historic designation for the Asheboro and Arlington Park area. He said, just for the record, this area is called the South Greensboro Historic District.

Concerning the ramp that Mr. Koonce was asking about earlier, the one Mr. Curry had said there was some question about as to whether it would remain, Mr. Rhodes said he had a concern because that particular ramp is the access for persons traveling east on Lee Street and needing to get to Douglas Park streets in that area. That ramp seems to be vital to him for the residents who are traveling east on Lee Street. He thought some consideration should be given to not removing the ramp; that was one of his main concerns.

Mr. Rhodes asked that the first slide be returned to the monitor. He inquired about a line shown off MLK at about Bragg Street, which seems to be going through a neighborhood.

Mr. Curry said he should have told the Board about the red lines. The red lines mean something to the City; these are the actual boundaries of the adopted Redevelopment Area. In reality, these lines mean nothing to the neighborhood, for the most part. The neighborhood boundaries do not necessarily follow the red lines, which are the official adopted Redevelopment Area boundaries. The reason it looks kind of funny in this area is because the City had another redevelopment area called Vance Street that abutted these lines here, and then there is another existing redevelopment area following Andrew Street and then along Vance Street; that is the Arlington Park Neighborhood. He could assure them that the Neighborhood Associations do not really recognize these red lines as their boundaries. They are simply kind of a political line put on a map to meet the requirements of Redevelopment Statutes.

Mr. Rhodes said that helped explain it, because it is confusing to a number of the citizens of Greensboro.

Mr. Curry said Mr. Rhodes was absolutely right. He said they have different boundaries for different areas for different purposes. City Council boundaries split this neighborhood in half; police boundaries split it up. In an ideal world, he would like to have everybody's lines in the same place, but unfortunately they haven't figured out how to do that yet. Going back to Mr. Rhodes' first point about the ramp on Lee Street, he said he could assure Mr. Rhodes that that would get a lot of hearing as they look at development proposals. It almost sounds as if Mr. Rhodes was in some of the neighborhood meetings, because there were a number of people who had the same concern. There are proposed two new streets that will provide two additional ways to get from Lee Street into the neighborhood on either side of where the ramp to MLK is. So as development proposals come in for those blocks, obviously the Transportation Department will be looking at access issues, the Neighborhood Committee is going to be looking at access issues and whether this really works for all the parties concerned.

Mr. McIntyre asked how did the neighborhood or City enforce the Architectural Guidelines; do they apply only where the City owns the property?

Mr. Curry responded yes. The Design Guidelines will only apply to the property being developed, because these are a part of the Development Standards attached to deed restrictions on the land. He said they had no way to attach those restrictions on other private property that they do not touch in some direct way.

Mr. McIntyre asked how did a neighborhood or the City obtain a piece of property that is a key part of the plan if the current owner does not want to sell.

Mr. Curry said that is called the Power of Eminent Domain, which the City and Redevelopment Commission will have once this plan is adopted by City Council. As to those sites identified on the acquisition list, once that plan is officially adopted, then the City or the Redevelopment Commission has the authority to purchase those properties through condemnation. Now that does not mean that they will, or even mean they will try to buy all those properties, but it gives the City and the Redevelopment the authority to do so if they desire.

Mr. Curry said in terms of whether the property goes into the plan or not, this is the process and property owners have been notified. They had a discussion last night at Redevelopment Commission with one property owner who did object, and they were fortunately able to work through an agreement to allow it to move forward. This plan does not envision that much additional acquisition. Most of the acquisition work has been completed. There are just a few sites left. Staff always tries to negotiate to buy property; that is always the first step in the process. Only when the Redevelopment Commission cannot reach an agreement with the property owner, normally over price, do they then initiate a condemnation action. The owners of property on the acquisition list had an opportunity to speak at the Redevelopment Commission meeting, they have an opportunity to speak here, and they will be notified and have an opportunity at the City Council public hearing as well.

Mr. Koonce said he thought the plan looks great and that it would work for the community. He did understand there was a 20-year old plan and someone's great mind decided that this is the time to bring it out and do something about it. So in the process of doing that, we have private funds that will fund the project. He asked if staff knows who those persons or companies may be, or would it go through some type of qualification to determine who is going to actually be a part of the funding process? When you decide that, will this Board have an opportunity to also get comments on their idea for the redevelopment of Ole Asheboro?

Mr. Curry said the private developers have not been identified yet. Staff will put out a request for proposals that private developers will then respond to. Each developer will be responsible for putting their own funding package together, getting their own lenders lined up. They each will have their own equity sources of funding, so that is particular to each developer team. In terms of the role of the Planning Board, you will have a number of touch points with this development work. You will be reviewing the traditional neighborhood development (TND) plan, which will come back for your action, so you will be looking at the zoning requirements, the design and development requirements that are a part of the TND plan. Past that, normally you do not get involved in reviewing specific development proposals; that is normally the role of the Redevelopment Commission.

Mr. Rhodes said going back to Mr. McIntyre's question regarding the architectural design, he was concerned because all other properties that have previously been purchased in that general area have been required to bring the property back to the original design, or as closely as possible. What he was concerned about here was as he looked down the Dorothy



Brown Park area, will the developers or whomever it is be required, since this is a historic area and designated as such, to construct the structures to comply with or agree with the historical aspect of the Ole Asheboro Neighborhood?

Carl Brower, Jr., Chairman of the Advisory Committee of the Ole Asheboro Neighborhood, said that in the plans that Mr. Curry has given to the Board, there are outlines and recommendations of what they would like to see. As Mr. Curry mentioned earlier, these outlines and guidelines will be adhered to on property that is now being controlled by the Redevelopment Commission. If you look through the whole plan, you will also see many infill lots, some of which the City controls and some of which are private property. Again, those properties that the City now manages would fall under these guidelines. They are asking that the owners of the privately owned parcels consider these guidelines. There is no requirement for them to do so because the City cannot control that. But anything that the City manages right now, these guidelines will be in place as part of the sellable land. It is their hope it will be followed through to keep the historical nature of the neighborhood. That was done to keep the historical area, to preserve its look and that is what they are trying to with this vacant property. Even on the North Asheboro Initiative, if you look at the fronts of those houses and businesses, they are similar to Southside, but yet they are a little more distinctive in their historical nature and in the architecture that they are asking for. They want to blend, but yet be different. We want you to know that you are in Ole Asheboro and not Southside. They are trying to bring back the viable Ole Asheboro Neighborhood as it once was, but this will be impossible without mixed use. This is their main corridor and this is what they would like to see there. Regarding the ramp, the Advisory Committee wants that ramp to remain. They understand though, depending on the development that is proposed there that they will review, there may be a need to close that ramp. He promised they would do everything they could to keep it open, but also as Mr. Curry mentioned, there are two other streets that will be cutting through to Lee Street to provide access. They are trying to be flexible to try to be sure they get the development they want and the results that they want.

Mr. Marks said he wanted to make sure he totally understood the point that was made about this falling under a historic designation. He was trying to understand how this differed in concept from, say, College Hill, where even if the City does not own the property, people have to go before a committee to get approval for changes to their home.

Mr. Brower said he was not really that familiar with the College Hill project, but in his mind, they are two different things.

Chair Downs said from his experience of living in College Hill, the way he understood the distinction from what is going on here is that College Hill is part of a local historic district that is founded ultimately in State authority that trickles down into the City's hands. There is a set of City Guidelines that apply to College Hill, Aycock and Fisher Park. Those are the three historic districts that do regulate primarily modification of exterior structural elements. Just to get rid of an urban myth, they do not regulate color of houses at all. The way he understood the distinction here at Ole Asheboro is, because the only tool the City has to deal with architectural controls is it owns the dirt and as a condition of sale, they will add a development condition that will say do this, that or the other. Private property in this neighborhood is unlike the private property in College Hill, Fisher Park and Aycock because it is not part of a local historic district.

Mr. Curry said that the South Greensboro Historic District that Mr. Rhodes was referring to is a National Register Historic District; it is not a locally designated district. In a National Register District, the only direct impacts are on government. Because we are using public funds, the City has to follow historic rules. All the guidelines we are talking about as part of this plan have to be reviewed ultimately and found to be compatible with the National Register Standards when we are doing new development within the boundaries of a National Register Historic District. That is the difference between that and the local districts. The National Register Historic District has no impact on private property owners, at least no negative impact. There are positive impacts because they can get tax credits if they do want to fix their properties up, but they do not have to do anything.

Mr. Rhodes said all of us are proponents of development and revitalization and we all want to see Greensboro grow, but he did want to think that the mixture is good and we do not deviate too far to the left as relates to the design structure in the neighborhood. Keep it compatible with the existing properties.

Mr. Brower said again the property they are talking about redeveloping is managed by the City. They have the guidelines. His feeling personally, and that of some of the other Board members, is basically if you see a trend in the area, you are not going to just come in there and go way to the right. It is just not human nature. Most of the property they are talking about, the largest parcels are on MLK North Initiative. The City owns basically all of that. They are not talking about large acquisitions. The largest one is the Music Garden property and they have an agreement as to what will be done there. They have a process that is outlined in the Agreement of Understanding of what they intend to have there. They have done everything they said they were going to do for over a year and a half on this. They brought in stakeholders from all facets of the community and surrounding communities because this is not the Asheboro Neighborhood Association, it is the City of Greensboro. So they have buy-in from everybody in the area and the stakeholders in the area, including community businesses, the Police Department, City Council persons and others.

Mr. Hall said that Mr. Brower's Committee supports this proposal.

Mr. Brower said his Committee voted unanimously for this proposal.

There being no other parties to speak at the public hearing, Chair Downs closed the public hearing portion of this matter.

Chair Downs said he thought there were three issues before the Board. One is to take this forward on a recommendation to the City Council. He said they would need to incorporate the Memorandum of Understanding between the Greensboro Redevelopment Commission and Herman and Lorna Heyge. That is the little parcel for the Music Garden that they carved out. So he has suggested language that we would move to recommend this plan with that carved out as per what occurred in front of the Redevelopment Commission. The second thing is the issue that Mr. Bryson brought forward as to reviewing the development guidelines for this plan as they are developed in the future. If the Board wants to exercise that authority, he thought they were going to have to recommend it to the City Council that this plan be approved with that as an amendment. Thirdly, if we want to deal with the issue of affordable housing, his thought was that they could add an element to this plan and the language that he would propose would be: That the Ole Asheboro Redevelopment Plan Request for

Proposal Review Criteria and Proposal Rating include provisions to create affordable housing. In other words, when the RFPs are sent out, one of the elements that they are going to review and weigh is are you going to create any affordable housing? His thought on that was that he thought Southside speaks volumes. It was a great development and wonderful stuff, and he applauded the City in this effort. His concern was that as we develop these areas, we gentrify these areas and the opportunity for affordable housing simply disappears. His suggestion was that they include review criteria along those lines. Those are the three issues on the floor right now and he would like to see some Board discussion as to how we deal with them.

Mr. Hall said his only concern was that the community is satisfied with the proposal that is being advanced. The Redevelopment Commission is satisfied with this proposal. He said he thinks that the Redevelopment Commission has a greater say in this than the Planning Board. Finally, he thought there was an inherent potential for us to get involved in trying to create a required or weighing standard in terms of weighing requests for proposals on the basis of someone being able to say and then do an affordable product, or if there is a preeminent desire in the community to try to maintain the general streetscape historic appearance of the community. What this plan seems to him to be all about is restoring the consistent theme of this area. There is going to be an inherent conflict between being able to build something that meets an affordable standard, even if it's one out of ten. When you ride down the street you're going to say, "Where did that zinger come from?" because it is going to be hard to do. The fellows making these proposals are down there to make money and you are basically going to say, "You're going to have to take some of your profit out of every job you do and you're going to have to allocate it to carry one product," where you really can't afford to put the gables and the dormers and brick or stonework, which you have a lot of down in that community, and make it look like the rest of the product you generate, because he believed the way they would probably RFP this will be to give builders a shot at a block of properties because that is the only way they can efficiently come in there and build 10, 12, 15 houses. He had a concern about the Planning Board trying to write too much into this proposal at the Planning Board stage, after the Redevelopment Commission has been working closely with the neighborhood. It is going to be that committee in the neighborhood that will accomplish the local neighborhood pressure on those lots that aren't within the City's control to get people to consider building there. Where it is really going to be important, more than all the rest of this, is that that local committee be able to exercise some influence with those builders to create product on those privately owned lots that remains consistent.

Mr. Brower said what he wanted this Board to recognize was this plan does not just talk about the MLK North Initiative; there are a whole lot of infill lots in this plan, if you look at the whole plan. Mr. Curry only emphasized the major Initiatives in this plan. Take the time and look at the packet. There are 72 lots in here that the City manages. We are talking about the MLK North Initiative right now. It is important to the MLK North Initiative to have the frontages and historical natures that you are talking about. It is not so important down on Julian Street, Omaha, or the 800 block of Douglas. Look at the whole plan, not just one section.

Chair Downs asked Mr. Brower if he had any concern about the creation or gentrification of the Ole Asheboro Neighborhood at large or did he have concerns about the affordability of units that are built within that neighborhood as it is revised?

Mr. Brower said he had a whole lot of concern about affordability. His understanding is that

they will identify individual parcels at a time. Also, the Advisory Board wants as many local developers, small developers, some of whom live in their neighborhood, as possible to have a chance to develop some of these lots. In doing this, they feel they will have a multitude of income ranges, low, middle, moderate, high. But any high dollar neighborhood development will basically be along your major corridors. That will be the MLK North Initiative. Everything else they think will be mixed use or mixed income, smaller lots. They don't see a big developer coming in trying to do that. They have some developers in their neighborhood who are anxious to try to do something in their neighborhood.

Chair Downs said that in short, Mr. Brower's view was the marketplace will dictate the affordability and can work effectively to produce that.

Mr. Brower said he was quite sure of that.

Chair Downs said he was persuaded by Mr. Hall's eloquent analysis of this, and because Mr. Brower apparently is satisfied that the neighborhood will produce affordable housing, he was going to withdraw that concern and defer to the community and the Redevelopment Commission.

Chair Downs said another issue that was before them was the Development Guidelines, and as those are developed, whether or not this Board has an opportunity to review those prior to their execution or implementation.

Mr. Bryson said he did not want to dictate what was going to specifically happen. The groundwork for the guidelines has already been done. He felt though, in being involved in the Southside project, if you go ahead and give the okay to two or three of the people in the neighborhood, then you have already dictated how that particular phase is going to happen. He knew from his own experience in Southside, a lot of the people who wanted to get involved in this property, a lot of that property had already been dictated out. So here we have a developer who has done an incredible job, but a native of Charlotte, and in our own backyard, the people that did want to get involved and had the facilities, the money, the time and effort to develop this area, would go to the City and the City would say, "Oh, no, we've already told him he could have that property," or "No, that property is already taken," and some of those properties are still sitting there with nothing on them. So he saw their passion in wanting to develop this project. He did not know that this Board could dictate how it is going to fall out, but he would hate to see two or so people determine how the outcome of Phase 1, 2, 3 or 4 is going to happen.

Mr. Rhodes said he agreed with Mr. Bryson because he same thing happened with the Willow Oaks Project, which was formerly Morningside Homes. That type of thing came up in another area where we had to discuss the same thing sometime back. That concerns him because, as has been mentioned, there are a number of local developers who were not given consideration to a certain extent.

Mr. Curry said he would make one quick statement about Mr. Rhodes' comments about Willow Oaks. Willow Oaks is going to be a multitude of developers. Mid-City Urban developed the first two projects in Willow Oaks by contract with the Greensboro Housing Authority, which is the lead developer for the project. Other developers will do other development work that is going to occur in Willow Oaks. There were requests for proposals

that were circulated for both multifamily and single-family development work. A number of local builders did respond to those proposals and he knew the single-family component builders will include a number of local builders, including Habitat for Humanity and including a couple of other small builders from Greensboro. So that is an emerging project, but the pieces you've seen so far are only a part of the overall development package.

Regarding the standards, you will see, assuming we get to a TND plan, a plan that will include the urban standards and the architectural standards that are to be part of the requirements of the TND plan. They will come back to you as part of that plan, so you will have an opportunity to review those standards and how they interact with the normal City Code standards. But the piece that you don't normally see will be would be more of a performance-based standards of how the Redevelopment Commission will enforce their contracts with these developers in terms of demonstrating their financial capabilities and their development team capabilities and their performance standards for when they have to do certain things. That is not a level that the Planning Board normally gets involved with; that's the type of standards that the Redevelopment Commission normally sets. But all the urban standards and architectural standards, the vast majority of that will be in the TND plan that will come to you for review.

Chair Downs said Willow Oaks was one model of developer proposal, Southside was a different model. What model did Mr. Curry envision Ole Asheboro following or is it something in between or some mix?

Mr. Curry said it was a different model. They do not envision having a lead developer like Willow Oaks, where you have Mid-City Urban playing the dual role of being a parcel developer of certain pieces and the oversight developer for all the parcels in the project. So they will be overseeing other developers that do work in Willow Oaks, but that is not the model they are thinking here. They are also not envisioning this as the Southside model, which is the master developer that does the whole project. So this is kind of a third model. This is having individual component developers for blocks of this development work. He said he was sorry that he failed to highlight the fact that they have several dozen scattered lots in this neighborhood where they will be doing infill development and those are probably going to be sold in very small packages of a couple of lots, 3-4 or 6 lots here and there so that they can get participation by local smaller builders who may not have the wherewithal to tackle a big block.

Chair Downs asked if it was typically the Redevelopment Commission that will approve the developer participation model? Has it been their role in the past to do that? Or has it been a City staff administrative decision that says this is how we are going to ship this out the door and see what we get?

Mr. Curry said that was the role of the Redevelopment Commission. Certainly anywhere the Commission has been the authority buying the property and providing it for development, it is their role to review the process for soliciting proposals and actually overseeing those selections.

Mr. Bryson said, so he understood, this Board will vote on a particular plan such as this, and then after it's voted on, then the Redevelopment Commission determines how that plan is

administrated? Is that yes or no?

Mr. Curry said they were the oversight staff that follows the implementation of that plan.

Mr. Bryson said his concern in this situation is, and maybe he was crazy that he saw it this way, it would seem to him that 15 builders developing 30 pieces of property could develop it quicker, faster, more efficient and to better standards versus 1 or 2 chosen people for a block or an area that could take potentially 6 months to a year. That was his concern.

Mr. Curry said he could say they have pretty clear direction from the community. They want a number of builders and a number of types of development packages available so we can hit a broad spectrum of both local and regional builders in this project, and they make that clear from the get go for staff.

Chair Downs said what he understood Mr. Curry to say was that the oversight of how broad that spectrum of potential developers is or how narrow, depending on what model you choose, has been the province of the Redevelopment Commission. Was that correct?

Mr. Curry said that was correct. What the Redevelopment Commission does is listen both to staff and to the neighborhood residents who are working with staff making those recommendations.

Mr. Hall said, as opposed to making any more changes to the request that is before the Board than was necessary, would it be possible just to ask staff to make certain that in this Board's materials or by e-mail that this Board get notice of any hearing before the Redevelopment Commission where the standards for the RFPs are going to be discussed further, because that is where this issue arises. Anyone on the Planning Board who has a concern about that could certainly appear at the Redevelopment Commission to express their opinion in terms of protecting the community.

Mr. Curry said he thought that was fair, and he thought that when they bring the TND plan back to this Board, staff could also have some information available on the development strategy at that point.

Chair Downs said he would take that as a response from staff that they will provide this Board with that notification.

Mr. Rhodes said he was pleased to know that there is some development that is going to go on in the eastern side of the city, particularly around that area. He certainly was going to say that he was really concerned about what they were doing here. Their purpose, he thought, was to either approve or disapprove the initiative itself rather than the type of structures. There will be people, and he would be one of those persons, looking at it to make sure that the developer does the kind of work that is going to be agreeable and consistent with whatever is necessary to keep the neighborhood being the kind of neighborhood that the community wants. He knew that Mr. Brower and those persons who are working with him are going to be what we call the "hawk eyes" in the community. So he thought if this Board did the initiative part, as far as voting it up or down, that would satisfy their purpose today.

Mr. Hall moved that the Planning Board approve the revision, subject to including the

suggested amendment presented by staff to remove approximately 1 acre of property from the proposed revision to the Redevelopment Plan for the Ole Asheboro District, seconded by Mr. Rhodes. The Board voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Downs, McIntyre, Hall, Bryson, Rhodes, Koonce, Marks. Nays: None.)

**B. REVISIONS TO EASTSIDE PARK COMMUNITY REVITALIZATION PLAN TO CHANGE THE ACQUISITION LIST BY ADDING FOUR PARCELS AND REMOVING FOUR OTHER PARCELS. (RECOMMENDED)**

Mr. Curry said they were reaching the end of redevelopment activity in the Eastside Park community. They have been working with this neighborhood since the late 1980s and officially designated the Eastside Park Community Revitalization Area in 1993. Since that time they have seen about \$8 million of private funds go into new homes and renovation of apartment buildings in this community. A number of properties were purchased by the Redevelopment Commission. Over 70 new homes have been built on lots that have been provided through the program.

As we do from time to time, staff reviews the neighborhood, do windshield surveys to determine whether all the work that was contemplated and all the work envisioned by the community has been completed. Staff's last review in Eastside Park indicated that a couple of minor modification needed to be made to the acquisition plan. Those changes are to add four properties to the acquisition list and remove properties from the acquisition list. Staff has provided the Board with a map showing the locations of those properties. The four being removed have either new homes or renovated apartment buildings, so they no longer are part of the required work of renovating; they have been done. The four properties that are proposed to be added to the acquisition list are, staff believes, the last four properties that are of such a condition that they need to be dealt with in this neighborhood. They include 206 and 208 York Street, which is a 5-unit apartment building; 218 York Street, which is a single-family house; and 1815 Spencer Street, which is another 5-unit apartment building. This proposal has been reviewed in a public meeting with the neighborhood organization, which wholeheartedly supported the proposal. Marie Stamey unfortunately could not be here today. She is the president of the neighborhood organization and the real leader in Eastside Park. The Redevelopment Commission reviewed this proposal yesterday evening and recommended its adoption. Staff asks the Board's approval of a recommendation to City Council that the plan be amended to add the four properties and delete the four properties from the acquisition list so the work in this community can be completed.

Chair Downs said since there was no one present from the public, he would close the public hearing portion of this matter.

Mr. Rhodes said most of the other members of the Board knew he was a strong proponent of development in the east side of Greensboro. He commended the Eastside Park Development. This area was formerly one of the blighted sections of the east side of Greensboro. Anything that happens in that area is a great improvement. What has now happened is that the neighborhood is quite different, the people are different and they are enjoying it more. He said it was unfortunate that it was next to a cemetery, but it is still a wonderful place to live.

Chair Downs said he had had the pleasure of working with Ms. Stamey and GGBA on some of the issues in Eastside Park. For those that have not had a chance to cruise out there, it is worth the drive. It is like the good stuff that the City and private parties are doing, so hats off to the folks out there.

Mr. McIntyre moved approval of revisions to the Eastside Park Community Revitalization Plan to change the acquisition list, seconded by Mr. Bryson. The Board voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Downs, McIntyre, Hall, Rhodes, Bryson, Koonce, Marks. Nays: None.)

**C. ORDINANCE AMENDING VARIOUS SECTIONS OF THE GREENSBORO DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE RELEVANT TO OFF-STREET PARKING. (RECOMMENDED)**

Mr. Ruska said he was very pleased to be before the Board with what is the first completed project that is a direct result of Connections 2025, the Comprehensive Plan. Specifically, this involves Objective 8E, which is to develop a comprehensive parking strategy, and short-term action 8E.1, which is to conduct a full review of current parking standards. In July of last year, a committee was formed to assist staff in doing this comprehensive review. The composition of that committee was Steve Showfety, representing Koury Corporation and TREBIC; Marty Kotis, who is a developer who has done some large projects, but is also interested in infill; Steve Branch from the Greensboro Merchants Association; Stephen Stansbury, who is a traffic engineer with Kimley-Horn; Ken Conrad, representing the Restaurant Association; and Jim Yarbrough, who was the former planning director in Winston-Salem, but was representing PART, the Piedmont Authority for Regional Transportation. Three GDOT staff members and a couple of staff members from Planning were on the committee.

The Committee reviewed the minimum off-street parking standards for individual uses. In doing that, they compared Greensboro with the typical municipalities in North Carolina that we look at, Charlotte, Raleigh, Winston-Salem and Durham. But they also asked the committee to suggest other cities that they were familiar with and that they thought had exceptional parking standards. Richmond, Virginia; Nashville, Tennessee; Charleston, South Carolina; Arlington, Virginia; and Montgomery County, Maryland were recommended and they used these 9 jurisdictions for comparison with Greensboro.

Mr. Ruska said that one of the overriding principals that they were looking at was, where possible, to relax our parking standards. For a number of years now the City has received comments that our parking standards were just too rigid, requiring too much off-street parking as a minimum. The Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee recognized that as well and that was part of this comprehensive review.

One of the other principals that guided them was, where possible, they wanted to get away from minimum parking standards that were based on the number of persons or the number of employees, the reason being that when developments first come in, the number of employees or the number of persons may not be known. It was sometimes very hard in the site plan review to get an accurate and honest answer as to how many employees a particular use would have. In the wholesale and manufacturing uses, for example, those were all based on the number of employees, and what they have done is base those now on



gross floor area. That was the second overriding principal, where possible, they were going to try to base their minimum standards on a more reasonable gross floor area basis.

He said the third thing they tried to do, where possible, was to make the retail standards and the service type use standards as comparable as possible. The reason for that was that when you have a strip center that started out as retail and the businesses go out of existence, the second or third generation uses may turn out to be service type uses. Under the existing ordinance, the parking standards are actually different for those uses. What that has led to is problems with the redevelopment of property because it started out with one standard and the new use coming in had to meet a more stringent standard and couldn't do that. In some cases businesses had to go to the Board of Adjustment and get a variance. That is one thing they hopefully have achieved through the amendments because now such uses as general retail uses, beauty shops, nail salons, equipment rental and leasing, all sorts of services and repair services now have the same proposed standard and that is one space per 300 square feet of gross floor area.

In terms of the minimum standard, he said they did go through the table line by line and compare Greensboro with those other 9 jurisdictions and tried, where possible, to pick out a more reasonable standard, in many cases, a relaxation of the standard. In some cases, our standard was low to begin with and in those cases, they didn't propose any change.

One other area that they looked at and which was in the Comprehensive Plan was to consider establishing maximum parking standards. Once they delved into that and for the time being, it was decided not to pursue that. Very few communities in the United States actually employ maximum standards. The ones that do are typically communities that have a lot more mass transit available than what Greensboro has. Quite frequently maximum parking standards have been employed as part of transit oriented developments. That is something the Comprehensive Plan calls for and, when and if we get to that point, we can again take a look at maximum parking standards that may support some kind of activity center, like a transit oriented development. In many cases, the ranges between minimum and maximum standards used by the few communities that have them were so large that they were meaningless. In other words, it would be unusual to ever reach the maximum. He said they looked at places like Orlando, Florida, which had maximum parking standards and scrapped them because they came to the realization that the number of parking spaces was not their problem, but it was the quality of the parking lots that was really the problem. There were a number of expressions to not do maximum parking standards from members on the committee as well, one of the thoughts being that they did not want to establish something that might hinder a third or fourth generation use of a property by employing a maximum standard that might squelch redevelopment of that property. For the time being, the committee is not recommending that we pursue maximum standards.

Mr. Ruska said another part of the comprehensive parking strategy that he wanted to mention was that it does refer to infill development, but as far as this particular committee was concerned, they weren't really dealing with infill because there is another comprehensive planning committee that is going to be looking at that and it is a much greater task and will take a lot longer to accomplish. Parking will be a part of what that infill committee looks at also. So they hope that by reducing standards generally, they have taken one step towards infill and then that second step will be actually dealt with by the other committee as part of that whole package of infill.

He said the committee added a provision for park and shuttle lots. That was something in which PART was specifically interested. Those particular standards that they have are patterned after what Winston-Salem/Forsyth County has developed for park and shuttle lots. In this case, they are allowing them both within residential districts with a special use permit or with schools and churches, subject to meeting certain development standards. The other approach is to allow them in nonresidential districts for uses that have a minimum of 175 parking spaces and 10 percent of those parking spaces could be designated as park and shuttle spaces. They need to be located on the periphery of the development. They need to be marked as park and shuttle spaces and they can be only used for short-term use, less than 24 hours.

Another requirement that they looked at, and it is buried in one of the tables but it has been a real concern for a number of years, is the width of a stacking space that is associated with a drive through. Our current width is 12 feet and that has been observed to be excessive. The committee is recommending 9 feet in width. In the last few years, we have had quite a number of Board of Adjustment cases where either banks or fast food restaurants have come in and said that they would like to get a variance to the width for the standard stacking space. The general principal was that when you start getting too many requests for the same kind for a variance, then you really need to look at your ordinance and adjust it, and that was what they did, resulting in reducing the width of the stacking space.

He said he was sure the Board members noticed that there was a very short geometric design standards table. That takes the place of one that fills up a full page and is very difficult for folks to follow. GDOT has looked at the standards and considerably compacted that table. This was also done in conjunction with a recent Planning Advisory Service study that came out on design standards for parking spaces and parking lots. It makes it so much simpler to interpret and use that table.

Another aspect that they added was the provision for alternative parking surfaces that can be approved by the City engineer. They actually had a request a couple of years ago for a non-asphalt, non-concrete surface and our ordinance is pretty rigid right now in that regard. So they put a provision in there saying that it is possible to use alternative surfaces if the City engineer okays them as being durable and will meet wear and tear to which parking lots are subject. Additionally in floodplains, watershed areas and tree protection areas there is a possibility of using alternative surfaces that may be more pervious with approval of the Technical Review Committee and, again, with approval and consultation with the City engineer to approve such surfaces.

One of the elements that was mentioned in Connections 2025 was the provision of encouraging shared parking, so they put a new provision into one of the subsections that allows for a reduction in parking for uses that share the same building or the same zone lot that may have different characteristics or hours of operation. In this particular instance, they are treating this similar to a transportation impact study and they are saying if somebody does a full fledged parking study that justifies a reduction in parking spaces, that the Zoning Enforcement Officer can authorize that reduction based on an approved study of that nature. They are requiring that it be done by a licensed professional engineer and that the study be supported by the site plan and information about the characteristics of the use. That is one change about which the committee is very excited because of the potential for shared

parking. Examples of that would be a restaurant in the same building with an office where they might have different hours of operation and different peak hours of operation. Another example might be a physical fitness center and a retail use, where the physical fitness center's busiest hours are very early in the morning and later in the evening, whereas the retail use has typical business hours. That provision is now available to encourage more shared parking.

Mr. Ruska said the committee started in July and the study represents 7 meetings of intensive work and he thought everybody was happy with what they had come up with.

Mr. Hall said the last comment about mixed use parking reduction was very interesting. He was sure both of them had read about the problems that occurred over on Green Valley with the steak house franchise, where the steak house came here and could not open at lunch because there were problems with the interpretation of the parking over there. Yet he knew a number of people who are in offices over there and there are lots of empty parking spaces because everybody leaves at lunchtime. So this would be an opportunity for the Zoning Administrator to step in and say, given the study and the fact that the lot clears out with people going, maybe a reduction could be approved that would let the steak house open at lunchtime.

Mr. Ruska said that very example actually was one of the items that the steering committee talked about when they were developing this particular section of the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Marks said on the back of page 10 where reassignment was discussed, he just wanted to make sure he understood that.

Mr. Ruska said that was an existing paragraph in the ordinance; that is not a proposed change.

Chair Downs closed the public hearing.

Mr. Bryson moved to recommend the ordinance amending various sections of the Greensboro Development Ordinance relevant to off-street parking to City Council, seconded by Mr. Koonce. The Board voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Downs, McIntyre, Hall, Rhodes, Bryson, Koonce, Marks. Nays: None.)

Mr. Ruska said he and Mr. Morgan had not had time to talk about this, but this would normally be scheduled for the February 17, 2004 City Council meeting.

Mr. Morgan said it should be moved along as quickly as possible.

**EASEMENT RELEASE:**

**A. RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING RELEASE OF 7.5 FEET ALONG THE EASTERN EDGE OF A DRAINAGE MAINTENANCE AND UTILITY EASEMENT AT 4403-4409 CAMDEN RIDGE DRIVE. (APPROVED)**

Mr. Cloud said all the relevant utility companies and City of Greensboro departments have all

agreed to release this easement.

Mr. Rhodes moved approval of this easement release, seconded by Mr. Hall. The Board voted 7-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Downs, McIntyre, Hall, Rhodes, Bryson, Koonce, Marks. Nays: None.)

**ITEMS FROM THE DEPARTMENT:**

None.

**ITEMS FROM THE CHAIRMAN:**

Chair Downs said he appreciated the thoroughly with which this Board examines items that come before it. Sometimes it takes a long time and looks like it drags, but he thought they were doing their job and he thought they were doing it well. He thanked the Board members for their participation and patience as they moved through some of the items.

**ITEMS FROM BOARD MEMBERS:**

Mr. Koonce said that one of his concerns was that when they were making a decision, they can really make good decisions based upon information that has been provided. To give a good example is what is taking place over at North Carolina A&T State University. When they came in and started building new dorms, the community people realized that they were creating means for students to have better facilities into which to move. So they knew that and, therefore, they had to do something in order to not lose the revenue that they were getting from the students, and not only students but the community as a whole, since some of the general public were staying in those apartments. However, when the renovation was done, those people had to do something to find places to go. He did not want the same thing to happen to Ole Asheville because we haven't dealt with how many actual homeowners we have. When we talk about the community, are we talking about homeowners because home ownership stabilizes communities? If you are an absentee landlord that people are renting from and you are asking those people to give their input to have a better community, and the redevelopment is starting to take place and they see an opportunity to either increase revenue for those individuals that own the land, they may either raise the rent or they may come in and tear down the old, build the new, which now is not affordable. So we have to make sure that we understand that if we are going to have a community, we need to talk about ownership. How much of the community is owned by the community and not necessarily people renting out property?

**SPEAKERS FROM THE FLOOR ON ITEMS UNDER PLANNING BOARD AUTHORITY:**

None.

**APPROVAL OF ABSENCES:**

Upon motion duly made, seconded and unanimously passed, the absences of Mr. Fox and Mr. Pike were approved.

\* \* \* \* \*

There being no further business before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 3:58 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert W. Morgan  
Acting Planning Director

RWM/jd.ps